

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1 and 18 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the March 26, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 9-17. The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (e) as being obvious over Johnson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,301,257 (hereinafter the Johnson reference). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates generally to computer networks, and more specifically, to moving information within networks.

Amended Independent claim 1 recites:

A system comprising:

a plurality of ports for sending and receiving frames;

a local switching device that performs high-speed switching;

a local forwarding database corresponding and coupled to the local switching device, the database allowing the local switching device to look up a known address that has been previously obtained and forward the frames based on the known address; and

a remote switching processing device that receives and processes frames, wherein **the local switching device sends an unknown destination address frame to all ports asking for a response frame when a destination address is unknown in the local forwarding database**, the local switching device receives the response frame from a receiving port and determines if a source address of the response frame

is known in the local forwarding database, and learns associations between Media Access Control (MAC) addresses and ports by forwarding the response frame to the remote switching processing device, and the remote switching processing device updates the local forwarding database corresponding to the local switching device based on the received response frame including the source address associated with the receiving port.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (e) as being obvious over the Johnson reference. The Johnson reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest a system as specified in amended independent claim 1. Unlike the system specified in amended claim 1, the Johnson reference does not show a system “wherein the local switching device **sends an unknown destination address frame to all ports asking for a response frame when a destination address is unknown in the local forwarding database**, the local switching device receives the response frame from a receiving port and determines if a source address of the response frame is known in the local forwarding database, and learns associations between Media Access Control (MAC) addresses and ports by forwarding the response frame to the remote switching processing device”.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over the above-cited reference. Claims 2-8 all depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 distinguish over the above-cited reference for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Independent claim 18, as amended, recites limitations similar to amended

independent claim 1. Specifically, claim 18 recites “**sending an unknown destination address frame to all ports asking for a response frame when a destination address is unknown in a local forwarding database**, the ingress switch engine receiving the response frame from a receiving port and determining if a source address of the response frame is known in the local forwarding database, the ingress switch engine learning associations between Media Access Control (MAC) addresses and ports by forwarding the response frame to the egress switch engine, the egress switch engine updating the local forwarding database corresponding to the ingress switch engine based on the received response frame including the source address associated with the receiving port”. Therefore, independent claim 18, as amended, also distinguishes over the above-cited reference for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Claims 19-23 all depend, directly or indirectly, from amended independent claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19-23 distinguish over the above-cited reference for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to amended independent claim 1.

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendment and remarks place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested.


If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

Date: June 28, 2004

By:

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Roger R. Wise", is written over a horizontal line.

Roger R. Wise
Registration No. 31,204
Attorney for Applicant(s)

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033